

the deficit down and about our economy. We had 216,000 new jobs last month. It is fragile, but we are beginning to come out of this. This is not the time to shut the government down.

What it is going to do to people in my State, to seniors—every week, there are hundreds of seniors—how many a day—170 a day applying for Social Security. They are not going to be able to do that, people who just turned 65. There are people who are going to try to get FHA loans and won't be able to. There are farmers who want to put seed in the ground who will not have the Farm Service open. This is not the time to do this. This is going to mean 800,000 Federal employees laid off. What is that going to do to the economy?

Look, there are things in this that I don't like, but I am willing to swallow and do it.

They want to cut hundreds of millions of dollars in hunger programs, \$700-plus million to cut food for women, infants, and children. It has been analyzed, and because of that, the neediest kids will not get their allotted amount of fruits and vegetables that is recommended. And that is not just during the closing; that is what they want to do for the rest of the year and presumably beyond that.

At the same time, we were here last December, and they wanted to extend the Bush tax cuts. They insisted on it, not just to your first million dollars or your second million dollars, to your tenth million dollars, to your 13th million dollars, or to your 300th million dollars. The top 400 income earners in this country average over \$330 million a year in income. They would rather those women, infants, and children not get food, the food they need to be healthy. I don't like that. Boy, do I not like that. Boy, do I not like that. But I was willing to swallow that for whatever is in the compromise to keep the government going so we could go through the year, so we could keep the economy going, so we continue the job growth we have had.

They know how to keep the government going. Take the ideological stuff off. Let's not resolve abortion in 27 hours. We have had more than 27 years—37 years—since *Roe v. Wade*. Let's not put a gun to everyone's head and say we have to resolve *Roe v. Wade* in 27 hours. That is just plain inappropriate.

I think you know how I feel. I think we know which side gives standing ovations when it is announced the government may very well be shut down. I think we know which side's crowd cheers and chants when they hear there may be a shutdown. I wish it were not that way. I wish we were working together. I hope we are working together. I hope we are working together on Monday.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 10:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and I ask that the time for morning business be for debate only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise to speak in morning business, even though it is the evening—the nature of the Senate rules and procedure. During the course of the day, we have had a number of colleagues coming to the floor and talking about the looming shutdown of the Federal Government.

During the last several hours, as we have spoken, Majority Leader REID and Speaker BOEHNER have been meeting with President Obama. It is my sincere hope that it has been a productive and fruitful meeting and that they will report that we have found a way out of this difficulty. I certainly hope that is the case. But if it is not, if we are destined to see this government shut down tomorrow night at midnight, it is a sad commentary—one that most American voters will resent and be disappointed with, and understandably so. It basically says the leaders have not been able to reach an agreement. Fingers of blame will be pointed in both directions, and the public can reach conclusions about who is responsible.

From my point of view, having worked with Senator HARRY REID on this from the beginning, I attended many meetings and heard many reports. It has been a frustrating experience because the Speaker's position in the House has changed so often. The amount of money they wanted to cut from the budget, where it would come from, and the policy riders that were part of this conversation have been changing with each meeting. I know Senator REID is a patient person. I have watched him as my friend since we were both elected to the House in 1982, and as my colleague in the Senate now—and this is my third term. He is patient, but he has been frustrated because of these changing scenarios.

The most recent change is one that I find most troubling, which is that it appears the debate is no longer over deficit reduction or spending cuts. It really isn't about how much money we are going to cut during the remainder of this year. Most Americans thought that was what we were debating and negotiating. It turns out now that it

has devolved into a debate over policy questions that have nothing to do directly—maybe even indirectly—with the budget deficit we face and the money we are going to spend.

For example, Speaker BOEHNER has been insisting today that the Senate adopt a provision which removes the authority of the EPA when it comes to issues involving pollution. I disagree with that position, but I have to say to the Speaker that he should check the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is not the most exciting publication, but if he looks at yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he will find that we spent most of yesterday debating this point.

Four different amendments were offered by Democrats and Republicans, including Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican minority leader, on this issue. We debated them for days and voted yesterday on the question of the authority of the EPA. There were four votes.

On the first one, there were seven Senators voting in favor of the change in that amendment. On the second amendment, seven Senators again. On the third amendment, 12 Senators voted in favor of the change. The fourth, offered by Senator MCCONNELL, was 50-50. At the end of the day none of them passed.

For Speaker BOEHNER to insist now that we include in our bill a provision that has already been debated in the Senate and rejected is fundamentally unfair and goes way beyond any question about deficit reduction and cutting spending.

The second item he raised is one that is even more puzzling. For some reason the Republican majority in the House believes the last election was a referendum on whether we provide medical services to women in America. We have the title X program—primarily for low-income women—that gives them access to basic health care, to the type of cancer screening and infection screening that we want all of the women in America to have access to. The House Republicans decided we should eliminate that Federal commitment and close the clinics, denying access to millions of Americans to basic primary health care.

How can that be in the best interest of our country and the costs that we incur to provide medical services? How can it be fair to these people, the men and women who use these clinics because they are accessible and affordable? They want to close them down. I don't recall that debate in the last election. I don't remember any candidate for the House or Senate saying: I want to go to Washington to close down access to health care for women, children, and men across America. That is, in fact, what they are saying now is the reason we need to close down the government. They think it is better to close down the government than to continue to give access to medical care to women under title X.

Planned Parenthood, which has a clinic in my hometown of Springfield,